



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/734,274 | 12/15/2003 | Karel Hero Mulder | 2005-1021 | 1503 |
| <div>466 7590 05/22/2009</div> <div>YOUNG & THOMPSON 209 Madison Street Suite 500 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314</div> | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| NGUYEN, HUONG Q | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 3736 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 05/22/2009 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/734,274 | | MULDER, KAREL HERO | |
| | Examiner | | Art Unit | |
| HELEN NGUYEN | | 3736 | | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Helen Nguyen.

(3) Max Hindenburg.

(2) James Voeller.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 May 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 24 and 27.

Identification of prior art discussed: Suydam (US Pub No. 20020193762), Dye (US Pat No. 3831446), Bortle (US Pat No. 4296502).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner's interpretation of the prior art was discussed. Applicant discussed the differences between the instant invention and the art of record. The Examiner agreed that claim language reciting said differences appear to overcome the outstanding rejection. Upon formal entry into the case, an updated search will be performed and the claims will be reviewed for patentability.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| /H. N./ Examiner, Art Unit 3736 | /Max Hindenburg/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736 |
|------------------------------------|--|